

Dickens' novels, like those of his contemporaries, are more explicitly indebted to the theatre than scholars have supposed: his stories and characters were often already public property by the time they were published, circulating as part of a current theatrical repertoire well known to many Victorian readers. In this book, Deborah Vlock argues that novels – and novel readers – were in effect created by the popular theatre in the nineteenth century, and that the possibility of reading and writing narrative was conditioned by the culture of the stage. Vlock resuscitates the long-dead voices of Dickens' theatrical sources, which now only tentatively inhabit reviews, scripts, fiction, and nonfiction narratives, but which were everywhere in Dickens' time: voices of noted actors and actresses and of popular theatrical characters. She uncovers unexpected precursors for some popular Dickensian characters, and reconstructs the conditions in which Dickens' novels were initially received.

Deborah Vlock has taught Victorian literature and culture at Brandeis University and Boston College. She is author of several articles on Victorian literature and culture, and a contributor to the *New Dictionary of National Biography*.



CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY  
LITERATURE AND CULTURE 19

DICKENS, NOVEL READING, AND THE  
VICTORIAN POPULAR THEATRE

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY  
LITERATURE AND CULTURE

General editors

Gillian Beer, *University of Cambridge*

Editorial board

Isobel Armstrong, *Birkbeck College, London*

Terry Eagleton, *University of Oxford*

Leonore Davidoff, *University of Essex*

Catherine Gallagher, *University of California, Berkeley*

D. A. Miller, *Columbia University*

J. Hillis Miller, *University of California, Irvine*

Mary Poovey, *New York University*

Elaine Showalter, *Princeton University*

Nineteenth-century British literature and culture have been rich fields for interdisciplinary studies. Since the turn of the twentieth century, scholars and critics have tracked the intersections and tensions between Victorian literature and the visual arts, politics, social organization, economic life, technical innovations, scientific thought – in short, culture in its broadest sense. In recent years, theoretical challenges and historiographical shifts have unsettled the assumptions of previous scholarly syntheses and called into question the terms of older debates. Whereas the tendency in much past literary critical interpretation was to use the metaphor of culture as “background,” feminist, Foucauldian, and other analyses have employed more dynamic models that raise questions of power and of circulation. Such developments have reanimated the field.

This series aims to accommodate and promote the most interesting work being undertaken on the frontiers of the field of nineteenth-century literary studies: work which intersects fruitfully with other fields of study such as history, or literary theory, or the history of science. Comparative as well as interdisciplinary approaches are welcomed.

A complete list of titles published will be found at the end of the book.

DICKENS, NOVEL  
READING, AND THE  
VICTORIAN POPULAR  
THEATRE

DEBORAH VLOCK



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, CB2 2RU, United Kingdom <http://www.cup.cam.ac.uk>  
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA <http://www.cup.org>  
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia

© Deborah Vlock 1998

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant  
collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without  
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1998

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeset in Baskerville 11.5/12 pt [VN]

*A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library*

*Library of Congress cataloging-in-publication data*

Vlock, Deborah.

Dickens, novel reading, and the Victorian popular theatre/

Deborah Vlock

p. cm. (Cambridge Studies in Nineteenth-century Literature and Culture: 19)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0 521 64084 9

1. Dickens, Charles, 1812-1870 – Knowledge – Performing Arts.
2. Dickens, Charles, 1812-1870 – Appreciation – Great Britain.
3. Fiction – Appreciation – Great Britain – History – nineteenth century.
4. Authors and readers – Great Britain – History – nineteenth century.
5. Books and reading – Great Britain – History – nineteenth century.
6. Popular culture – Great Britain – History – nineteenth century.
7. Theatre – Great Britain – History – nineteenth century.
8. Performing Arts in literature. I. Title. II. Series.

PR4592.P45V58 1998 823'.8-dc21  
98-21087 CIP

ISBN 0 521 64084 9 hardback

*For my grandmother, Nellie Lehman*

*In memory of my sister, Andrea Vlock Axel  
September 20, 1960–September 20, 1996*

To a mouth  
which spoke a thousandfold  
I lost –  
I lost a word  
that had remained with me:  
sister.

Paul Celan  
trans. Jörg Drewitz





## *Contents*

<i>List of illustrations</i>	<i>page</i> x
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xi
1. Introduction	i
2. Dickens and the “imaginary text”	8
3. Theatrical attitudes: performance and the English imagination	56
4. Patter and the politics of standard speech in Victorian England	93
5. Charles Mathews, Charles Dickens, and the comic female voice	129
6. Patter and the problem of redundancy: odd women and <i>Little Dorrit</i>	159
7. Conclusion	190
<i>Notes</i>	193
<i>Bibliography</i>	215
<i>Index</i>	223

## *Illustrations*

1. *Hauteur*. Plate from Henry Siddons, *Practical Illustrations of Rhetorical Gesture and Action* (1822). Reproduced with kind permission of Ayer Company Publishers, Inc., North Stratford, N.H., 03590. page 24
  
2. *Painful Recollection*. Plate from Henry Siddons, *Practical Illustrations of Rhetorical Gesture and Action* (1822). Reproduced with kind permission of Ayer Company Publishers, Inc., North Stratford, N.H., 03590. 25
  
3. Hablôt K. Browne (Phiz), *Mr. Ralph Nickleby's "Honest Composure."* Original illustration for Charles Dickens, *Nicholas Nickleby* (1838–9). Reproduced with kind permission of Boston University Library Special Collections. 26
  
4. William Hogarth, *A Just View of the British Stage*. Engraving (1724). Courtesy, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. 69
  
5. William Hogarth, *Strolling Actresses Dressing in a Barn*. Engraving (1738). Courtesy, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. 72
  
6. Hablôt K. Browne (Phiz), *Mr. Peggotty's Dream Comes True*. Original illustration for Charles Dickens, *David Copperfield* (1849–50). Reproduced with kind permission of Boston University Library Special Collections. 84

## *Acknowledgments*

This book could not have been written and revised without grants from the Society for Theatre Research, whose generous assistance enabled me to undertake research in London; the Northeast Modern Language Association; and the Louis, Frances, and Jeffrey Sachar Fund. A scholarship from a Center for Theatre Education and Research allowed me a necessary summer's study in London and Stratford. I am grateful to all four donors. Eugene Goodheart and Paul Morrison, two fine critics, dispensed advice and encouragement, without which I would too often have been lost in a maze of my own making. Raphael Seligmann and Anke Finger read drafts of chapters and made me laugh during this occasionally dispiriting undertaking. And Homer Swander, with typical generosity and enthusiasm, fostered my work in countless large and small ways; my debt to him is great, and duly noted.

Several theatre professionals donated some of their time and wisdom to this project, and I should like to thank them here. Patrick Stewart, whose *A Christmas Carol* taught me a great deal about reading and playing Dickens, shared with me what he does and how he does it; Stephen Rashbrook gave me an hour's conversation in the Duke's Head pub about the Royal Shakespeare Company's *Nicholas Nickleby*, in which he took part; John Culme shared his experience as a collector of Victorian theatre materials; and Tony Church discussed acting and literature with equal acumen and enthusiasm.

Josie Dixon and Linda Bree of Cambridge University Press walked me through a complicated process with great kindness and competence – I wish every writer such excellent editors. The staffs at the Harvard Theatre Collection and the British Library Department of Manuscripts made maneuvering through the maze of materials therein quite a bit less daunting; I thank them collectively for their patient help.

Finally, thanks to my loving family, now only three: Ruth, Richard, and Robert. Andrea always believed this book would be published but

did not live to see it. My own Annika, her namesake, will perhaps read it someday instead. To Jörg Drewitz, who has shared with me some of life's sharpest pains and sweetest pleasures, I can only repeat what Mozart's Sesto confides more mellifluously to his love: *il mio destin tu sei, tutto farò per te*.

The first chapter of this book appeared previously, in a shorter version, as "Dickens, Theater, and the Making of a Victorian Reading Public," in *Studies in the Novel*, 29, 2, 1997: pp. 164–190.

## *Introduction*

This book comes into the world at a time when Victorian studies are dominated by the spirit of Michel Foucault, whose construction of modern European social history, with its evolution from the spectacular, public discourse of the Enlightenment to the privatized, domesticated culture of the industrial revolution, has informed a large body of exciting scholarship. This study, certainly, is indebted to *Discipline and Punish* and *Madness and Civilization*, which have enabled me to imagine and describe the structures of social differentiation and containment which operate in Victorian novels and popular entertainments.<sup>1</sup> But if Foucault's voice is generally present here, it is here, much of the time, to be challenged, as a voice potentially as totalizing and controlling as the cultural forces it describes. If we accept as accurate the discursive shift he defines as a more or less material cultural change occurring around the end of the eighteenth century, a shift from the spectacular to the speculative, from the corporal to the carceral, then we are led to accept as well a vision of novel reading and writing in Victorian England which emphasizes isolation, privacy, the contemplative reading subject – a reductive and romanticized view of a complex subject. Acts of novel reading and writing took place in “public spaces” – that is, in the terms of a popular agreement, a framework of consensual cultural ideas and the signs assumed to represent those ideas – in the nineteenth century, even when performed in isolation and silence. Novel reading literally entered the public sphere when novelists like Dickens took to the platform and performed public readings, and, less obviously, when the novels themselves borrowed heavily from the theatre, employing almost casually, and with confidence in their readers' collective understanding, some of the standard theatrical signs of the time.

This is not to say that an attention to the inward, the carceral, the embracing structures of control operating in nineteenth-century Europe is uninteresting or invalid. Indeed, this book enthusiastically examines

Victorian social controls, performing readings which might well be described as “Foucauldian” themselves. But I wish to turn the carceral cell inside out, to expose the very public nature of the Victorian hegemony. In other words, I object not to the assumption that the nineteenth century moved to bourgeois rhythms, or was buried under layers of ideology, but to an unexamined belief in the interiority of modern culture. A number of scholars have embraced that idea, and produced suggestive but perhaps short-sighted treatments of nineteenth-century novels and novel readers. D. A. Miller may be the most prominent among them, and while *The Novel and the Police* remains among the most successful books on the subject, it almost ruthlessly appropriates Victorian novels and their readers, packaging both entities in cells, if you will, of its own construction, and locking its doors against alternative treatments.

Since the novel counts among the conditions for [its] consumption the consumer’s leisured withdrawal to the private, domestic sphere, then every novel-reading subject is constituted – willy-nilly, and almost before he has read a word – within the categories of the individual, the inward, the domestic. There is no doubt that the shift in the dominant literary form from the drama to the novel at the end of the seventeenth century had to do with the latter’s superior efficacy in producing and providing for privatized subjects.<sup>2</sup>

This passage engages in a critical policing of its own: it is difficult to resist the assertion that the reading subject is constituted implicitly, even “naturally” – “willy-nilly, and almost before he has read a word” – within the categories Miller has devised for him. But if we do resist, if we entertain the possibility that the nineteenth century, despite its privileging of the inward and private, perceived itself in other ways as well – published its image, its values, its desires, in extravagantly public venues like the theatre, and depended on such publicity to promote a discourse which favored “interiority” – then it is less clear than Miller suggests that the shift in the dominant literary form, from drama to fiction, was due to the novel’s greater efficacy in constituting the private subject, or indeed, that this shift occurred at all.

The primary assumption behind this study is that Foucault’s historical model performs the same discursive function it describes, totalizing and containing nineteenth-century culture in a way that renders it *readable* to the twentieth century, but which erases its very strong spectacular, externalizing impulses. This paradigm does not adequately express the differences between early modern and modern cultures; it polarizes them without considering certain inevitable complications in

the constructed binarism, the moments, for example, when nineteenth-century Europe recognizes itself through publicly displayed bodies, or the prototypical carceral imaginations of certain early European writers, like Tommaso Campanella (*La Città del Sole*, 1623). One way to think of the present study's theoretical position is to imagine it conversing with Foucault, but also with Bakhtin, whose "dialogic" novel reverberates with theatrical voices, a more public entity than the one permitted by Foucault's vision, but subject to the same hegemonizing desires described in *Discipline and Punish*. Foucault has taught us how to recognize the structures of social control – this book, certainly, has benefitted from the lesson – but Bakhtin had already, preemptively, as it works out, demonstrated how such controls are constantly subverted by the nineteenth century's irrepressible heteroglossia. I wish my argument to encompass both possibilities, the Bakhtinian (discursive regulation which generally fails) and the Foucauldian (discursive regulation which generally succeeds), privileging neither one but finding each useful at one time or another. In every instance, however, I shall insist upon the primacy of public display, a phenomenon which Foucault has associated with pre-industrial Europe but which continued to be a powerful organizing and controlling force through the nineteenth century, and indeed, continues to do its work in our century as well.

Some of the strongest evidence for this continuity lies in the popular entertainments of nineteenth-century England. As this book hopes to demonstrate, the tropes of the theatre gave voice to other forms of artistic and popular expression; people read novels, newspapers, social criticism – indeed, just about everything worth reading – through the lens of popular performance. In other words, the "drama" was not supplanted by the novel in the nineteenth century but merged with it, enabling the novel to exist. Dickens, who figures at the center of this study, regularly borrowed characters, dramatic idioms, even stories from the melodrama, and the popular theatre borrowed equally from him; the same may be said for many of his contemporaries.<sup>3</sup> What this means is that the Victorian novel did not really resemble the discrete textual unit we receive it as today, the self-contained package Miller imagines as privately and personally consumed, but was loose and fluid – particularly when published serially, as so many novels, including Dickens', were – and attentive to the theatrical developments which were at once its source and its competition. That Dickens' novels were so often adapted and produced before he had finished writing them raises some interesting and exciting questions about the role of theatre

and performance in their composition. For example, when adapters like Edward Stirling or W. T. Moncrieff devised what seemed a probable ending to one of the novels, so that it could be quickly produced, what effect did that have on the ending Dickens ultimately wrote? He hated most of the adaptations of his novels, but he appears to have followed them carefully. The probability that novelists, like Dickens, whose serial fiction was regularly plagiarized, were forced to dance with hack playwrights as they wrote, requires us to rethink our relationship to these texts.

If we imagine the novel and the drama as intimately conversant with each other, rather than in binary relation or in chronological sequence with drama the genre of early modern culture, and the novel, which supersedes it, the product of full-blooded modernity, we must likewise imagine a reading subject constituted otherwise than in the interior spaces of home and privatized imagination. This is what I have undertaken in this book: a repositioning of the Victorian bourgeois reading subject, a re-visioning of the Victorian novel, and a recovery of the conditions in which both novels and novel readers were made.

At the center of this study lies the theatre, lively, healthy, magnificently vocal – not a thing of the past but an integral part of the Victorian present. One should perhaps avoid the use of the word *drama* in describing the genre of writing produced for the stage, because it implies a literariness which popular Victorian plays emphatically lacked. These were often colorful, inelegant vocal-spectacular displays, written in and for a virtual moment, and significant now primarily for their significance then. That significance was substantial: the popular theatre mediated acts of novel reading and writing, structured class and gender relationships, informed political discourse, and entered the fields of journalism and social science, providing small- and large-scale models of relationship.

Several recent works on nineteenth-century fiction and theatre proved to be indispensable to this project. D. A. Miller's *The Novel and the Police* and *Narrative and its Discontents* articulated some of the novel's important regulating functions, like its self-policing and its understanding of generic and discursive imperatives, and despite my arguments with Miller's construction of the Victorian novel and reader as ultimately privatized entities, I could not have formulated my own position without his, against which this study differentiates itself.<sup>4</sup> Martin Meisel's *Realizations*,<sup>5</sup> far grander than this book aspires to be, articulates the intersections among the arts that I have presumed here. Joseph Litvak's *Caught in the Act: Theatricality in the Nineteenth-Century English Novel*



says a great deal about Victorian attitudes towards the theatre, and about the positioning of otherness – particularly homosexuality and femaleness – within performative or theatrical and narrative apparatus.<sup>6</sup> Litvak's study "repeatedly emphasizes the *normalization* of theatricality, its subtle diffusion throughout the culture that would appear to have repudiated it . . . [and shows] how, if theatrical structures and techniques underlie or enable various coercive cultural mechanisms, the same structures and techniques can threaten those mechanisms' smooth functioning" (pp. x–xi). These are ideas underlying this work as well, which implies many of the conclusions of Litvak's study even when it, perhaps ungratefully, challenges or rejects some of his premises – especially those Foucauldian-inspired assumptions which I find so insufficiently circumspect, or permissive, to accommodate all of the facets of Victorian experience.

Much has been written over the past twenty years or so on the Victorian theatre, and while almost all of it is valuable in one way or another, this body of criticism tends to be motivated by narrative concerns, reading theatre and theatricality narrativistically, and linking the novel and other popular forms to the theatre biographically or anecdotally. (Two notable exceptions are George Taylor's *Players and Performances in the Victorian Theatre*, and Joseph Roach's *The Player's Passion*.<sup>7</sup>) In other words, literary scholarship has typically imagined "theatre" – a phenomenon, in the nineteenth century, only nominally literary but overwhelmingly vocal, gestural, spectacular – to be synonymous with "drama," and has sought in it the narrative structures which underlie realist fiction, reading its relationships to the social and literary worlds as one reads novels, chronologically, sequentially; relying on literary interpretive strategies, on the existence of the signifying properties typically found in written text. This suggests, more than anything, that we, as readers and writers, are constituted narratively rather than theatrically; that our organizing apparatus "naturally" constructs our experience in linear, chronological sequence, presuming logical, "storied" relationships. In this we differ from the Victorians, who understood their theatre, their literature, even their social world, in terms of very explicit non-narrative signs (voices, postures) as well as the stories which tied those signs into narrative units. Still, the work of scholars like Nina Auerbach, Philip Collins, Michael Booth, George Rowell, Edwin Eigner, Robert Garis, and others has shown that the nineteenth-century English theatre is a legitimate and exciting topic of discussion, and the present study has profited from them.<sup>8</sup>

In order to evoke acts of Victorian novel-reading and writing – and to some extent, the everyday performances of Victorian life – I have had to imagine a world in which reading took place under different circumstances than it does today; a world laced with glittery threads of theatricality, in which voices and physical gestures crowded the imagination, haunting the reading and writing subject. (Although this study primarily examines the influence of the theatre on novel writing and reading, it often draws on the other art forms – music, painting, and illustration, for example – which exerted a similar influence, as Meisel’s expansive *Realizations* has shown us.) The fact of these “hauntings” is suggested in the novels and theatrical entertainments themselves; I had merely to learn how to experience them, to hear the theatrical voices and rhythms blended into fictional narratives. This was less difficult than one might imagine. Reading aloud had always been a part of my literary experience; my father read to me all of Dickens’ novels, some more than once, from my early years in primary school through college, and I continue to explore spoken text as a regular part of literary interpretation. In reading Dickens aloud, one finds certain rhythmic and inflective patterns and quite “naturally” finds a series of dramatic voices at one’s disposal. His texts require this, and somehow make it happen. I suggest that we read Victorian novels aloud as a matter of course – the Victorians did – if we wish to recover them in their authentic forms.

But imagining how Victorian novels sounded, felt, and tasted to the nineteenth century requires more than acts of oral reading. It requires acts of exploration, imagination, and reconstruction. In order to describe successfully the atmosphere in which English novels were produced and consumed I have had to coin a phrase: *imaginary text*. I wish “imaginary text” to resonate with similar constructions by other cultural theorists – Paul Davis’ “culture text” is one of the first to come to mind<sup>9</sup> – but to emphasize, with its insistence on imagination, the tenuous distinction between “reality” and theatre or fiction which distinguishes, as I shall argue, the nineteenth century. “Imaginary text” should suggest a “reading space” located outside of the actual narrative embodiments of Victorian novels, and inside the field of sociodramatic possibilities – of idioms and gestures and a whole range of signifiers – established by popular entertainments. Victorian novel readers read in this space; both they and their novels were born into an agreement – written, as it were, in the language of theatricality – about certain types of character and story. Restoring some of these agreements or imaginary texts has en-

abled me to approximate, in my own readings, the very aural and spectacular act of Victorian reading, and it has tuned my ears to the voices, conventional but deeply powerful, which sang in printed narrative text – particularly Dickens' text.

The following chapters attempt to share that recovery, to demonstrate how the nineteenth-century novel fitted into its own historical moment, and how the recently popular interpretive paradigms fail to adequately express the nature of that moment. There have been certain difficulties inherent in this project, because our historical moment has integrated the structures of narrative so deeply into its framework that the critical language available to describe Victorian theatricality always seems to imply narrativistic or novelistic relationships. Still, it is possible to peer through the inevitable cracks in the foundation, at a world perhaps more foreign than we have liked to think, and to watch it go about its business of knowing itself and knowing others.